

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 7 and 18 have been canceled and claims 1, 8 and 19 have been amended. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6, 8-17 and 19-24 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested. All of the rejections are traversed below.

Applicant request entry of this Rule 116 Response and Request for Reconsideration because the amendments of claim should not entail any further search by the Examiner since no new features are being added or no new issues are being raised. Claim 1 has been amended to include language substantially similar to what appears in claim 24, and claims 8 and 19 have been rewritten in independent form.

As discussed on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 8 and 19 contain allowable subject matter, but were objected to because each depended on a rejected base claim. By this amendment claims 8 and 19 have been rewritten in independent form. Therefore, it is submitted that independent claims 8 and 19 are patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art.

Claims 1-7, 9, 11-18 and 20-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Buxton (6,115,025) on pages 3-5 of the Office Action. In response to the Amendment filed January 12, 2007, the Examiner stated "the preamble of [claim 1] ... is considered very broad" at lines 11-12 and cited "allowing art work or documents to change orientation while interface elements remain in fixed orientation" in Buxton at column 3, lines 8-10 as anticipating claims 1, but apparently did not give patentable weight to the body of claim 1. By this amendment, claim 1 recites "the first graphical user interface part is automatically reoriented relative to the display in accordance with a change to orientation/location information; and allowing the second graphical user interface part to remain in a same orientation" at lines 3-5. Thus, the present application is directed to a graphical user interface with two user interface elements, one user interface element that is automatically reoriented and one user interface element that that is not reoriented, as shown in Fig. 1 by the reference numeral 22 and 28.

In contrast, Figs. 3a and 3b of Buxton do not show a graphical user interface with a first part and a second part but rather shows a single part user interface. Buxton describes the reference numerals in Figs. 3a and 3b as "[t]he model 34 turns with the display 32 while the interface element 30 remains aligned with the normal viewing" in column 4, lines 37-39. Nothing has been cited or found in Buxton that anticipates the first part element and second interface

part as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, claim 1 is not obvious in view of Buxton because claim 1 recites a first interface part that is automatically reoriented and a second interface part that maintains its orientation.

Therefore, in view of the above, it is submitted that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. Likewise, dependent claims 2-6 depend on claim 1 and it is submitted that claims 2-12 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art.

Independent method claim 9 recites "an element of the user interface to the user, where another element of the user interface" at lines 2-3. Clearly claim 9 is directed to more than one user interface element. Therefore, it is submitted that claim 9 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art.

Independent method claim 11 currently recites multiple interface elements ("an element of the user interface ... another element of the user interface"). Clearly claim 11 is directed to more than one user interface element. Therefore, it is submitted that claim 11 and dependent claim 12 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art.

Independent method claim 13 recites "a method of orienting elements of a user interface" where the method "automatically orienting one of the elements of the user interface relative to the determined user". The Office Action cited "[I]t is the further object of the present invention to detect the orientation of plural users" in column 3, lines 4-5 of Buxton as anticipated claim 13. Thus, the prior art refers to a plurality of *users*, not a plurality of *elements*. Therefore, it is submitted that claim 13 and dependent claims 14-17 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art.

Independent apparatus claim 20 recites "a user interface element ... with another user interface element" at lines 1-7. Clearly claim 20 is directed to more than one user interface element and it is submitted that claim 20 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art.

Independent apparatus claim 21 recites "allowing one or more interface elements to change in orientation ... while one or more other interface elements remain in a fixed orientation" at lines 1-4. Clearly, claim 21 is directed to more than one user interface element and it is submitted that claim 21 and dependent claim 22 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art.

Independent claim 23 recites "a first interface element and a second interface element" at lines 1-2. Clearly, claim 23 is directed to more than one interface element and it is submitted that claim 23 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art.

Independent claim 24 recites "A graphical user interface method for a display comprising a first interface part and a second interface part" at lines 1-2. Clearly, claim 24 is directed to more than one interface element and it is submitted that claim 23 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art.

The dependent claims, as discussed above, depend from the above-discussed independent claims and are patentable over the prior art for the reasons discussed above. The dependent claims also recite additional features not taught or suggested by the prior art. For example, claim 5 emphasizes a change to the orientation/location information for the interface part is determined automatically based on a spatial orientation/location change relative to the display. The prior art does not teach or suggest such. It is submitted that the dependent claims are independently patentable over the prior art.

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

6/14/07

By:



David E. Moore

Registration No. 59,047

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501